

REMARKS

The independent claims require 'an elapsed time associated with the displayed path marker from the previous run.' As presented in the previous amendment and in a prior telephonic interview, the 'current lap time' of Mott is not the same as the elapsed time.

The Examiner also references a "ghost car" in Mott to display a complete recording of a lap previously run by the user. The path markers of the independent claims recited in the independent claims are not equivalent to this ghost car. The path markers indicate a comparison of elapsed time of a current video game session to an elapsed time based on a previous run. The ghost car in Mott compares the location of the player to a location of the player in a previous run.

Since the 'best time' disclosed in Mott is the complete time of the last lap, to combine the teachings of Yoshida and Mott results in a path marker that merely compares the current lap time to the complete time of the last lap. Combining Yoshida and Mott, therefore, fails to result in "determining a color for a displayed path marker of the visual string of path markers based upon an elapsed time of a current video game session and an elapsed time associated with the displayed path marker from the previous run" as recited in the independent claims.

Notwithstanding, the Applicant has introduced a further amendment to the independent claims with respect to “the current location is after the starting line but prior to the finish line for a course being traversed in the current video game session.” The Examiner (in the current rejection) points to the cited references as disclosing a TOTAL lap time—start to finish. The Applicants contend that this is an unreasonable interpretation of the claims as were previously presented in Amendment C.

Notwithstanding, the present amendment addresses (for example) an ‘in the middle of the race’ time lapse thereby disclaiming the overly broad ‘start/finish’ argument presented by the Examiner. As such, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

Independent claims 19, 24, and 30 recite similar claim elements and the Applicant believes that the rejection of claims 19, 24, and 30 is overcome for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSIONS

The Examiner's rejections of independent claims 1, 19, 24 and 30 are overcome in that the cited references fail to teach each and every limitation of the claims.

The references of record fail to disclose, at least, an elapsed time associated with the displayed path marker from the previous run, specifically "the current location is after the starting line but prior to the finish line for a course being traversed in the current video game session."

As such, the cited art fails to evidence the obviousness of the independent claims and the rejections set forth in the *Office Action* are overcome.

The Applicant respectfully requests the passage of the present application to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative with any questions concerning this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Campbell

November 10, 2008

By: /Tam Thanh Pham/
Tam Thanh Pham (50,565)
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
T: 650.812.3400
F: 650.812.3444